



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

quartet of letters in your issue of November 8. I see no ground for invoking the larger public of SCIENCE. Accepting, however, the change of *venue*, permit me to say, first, I never dreamed of disparaging a rival journal, or of implying in the remotest way either that mine was or even that the *Review* was not an *Archiv*. The reference was solely to the twice-considered plan of dropping all reviews, notes, etc., from the Journal and printing only researches as long, perhaps, as those lately printed separately by Profs. Cattell, Fullerton, Nichols, Brandt, etc.

Still less, if possible, did I dream of making or implying any claim so preposterous as that I or the Journal had 'accomplished nearly everything' 'for the advancement of psychology in America.' In the development of a new academic 'department' a crucial point is, as I deem it, when an instructor is appointed whose central work and interest is in that line. Such a point, I think, was marked both at the University of Pennsylvania and at Columbia by Prof. Cattell's appointment; at Wisconsin by Prof. Jastrow's; at Toronto by Dr. Kirschmann's; at Harvard by Dr. Nichols'; at Yale by Dr. Scripture's, and long ago at Johns Hopkins by my own. This, and this alone, was my theme. Had it been of the pioneer work, no less crucial, which made these appointments possible, which was done by Profs. James, Ladd, and earlier by President McCosh and others, I should not only have desired to say nearly all they have said, but more. To Prof. James, especially, I owe a debt I can never repay, unless by trying to influence him to correct the views in which we more and more widely differ, some of which he will bear me witness I have earnestly tried to do.

I am very sorry the name of Toronto got on the list of laboratories affected by our work. It is a mistake I cannot account for, and I am glad to correct the error with due apologies to all aggrieved thereby. The difference too between the wording of the relation between the assistant editors and myself, Dr. Sanford desires me to state, was his regrettable mistake, and will be corrected, according to the original announcement, in the next number.

As to the comparative influence of Yale and Clark upon men who have attended both, I

prefer to yield all claims rather than divide the child; so I do as to Dr. Scripture, and also as to the size of my 'influence' at Princeton. As Socrates said of the disputations of the sophist Euthydemus, I would rather be refuted by such arguments than to use them.

For one, I sincerely hope that in this transition period the psychological atmosphere will not become too tense for a spirit of hearty coöperation, or too lax for healthful or virile competition.

G. STANLEY HALL.

CLARK UNIVERSITY, November 18, 1895.

THE BREHM CUTS AGAIN.

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: Referring to SCIENCE of April 5, 1895, p. 387, and June 21, p. 682, I beg to say that my original charge of libel against Dr. C. H. Merriam, for using the term 'piracy' in connection with the appearance of the Brehm cuts in the *Standard Natural History*, is not in the least affected by what appears in SCIENCE of October 25, 1895, p. 648. I believe the latter to be substantially correct; but it relates to an entirely different matter, viz.: action brought to recover damages for alleged breach of contract concerning resale of Brehm cuts and their subsequent use in other connections than the *Standard Natural History*. The case will be found fully and no doubt fairly stated in the Publishers' Weekly of October 26, 1895, p. 716; but it is one that I never raised, and know nothing about—only that it has nothing to do with the point I made; and I should not now bring it up again, except to correct a very possible misapprehension on the part of some who may be misled into the belief that my original charge does not remain in full force.

ELLIOTT COUES.

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 17, 1895.

QUATERNIONS.

EDITOR OF SCIENCE:—The communication in a recent issue of SCIENCE in reference to the formation of an International Society for the purpose of advancing the study of Quaternions is one of great significance to the friends of the subject in this country. The time is certainly fitting for the organization of such a society and